The Travancore-Cochin Payment of salaries and Allowances Bill—*(contd.)*

Clause 1

Mr. Speaker: Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai has moved his amendment to clause (1) and it was opposed by the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: I would like to know whether the hon. Minister has finished his speech.

Minister for Finance and Food **(Sri K. M. Korah)**: I finished the speech then and there.

The amendment was put and lost.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: I demand a poll. A poll was taken when the House divided as follows :

AYES—23

1	Sri.	A. Nesamoni
2	,,	Kalathil Velayudhan Nair
3	,,	N. Daniel Jose
4	,,	A. Atchuthan
5	,,	D. Gnanasigamoni
6	,,	C. V. Iyyu
7	,,	R. K. Ram
8	,,	Sadasivan
9	,,	D. Ponniah
10	,,	Gabriel Nadar
11	,,	N. Neelakantaru Pandarathil
12	,,	Mannathu Padmanabha Pillai
13	,,	P. K. Kumaran Asari
14	,,	E. Gopalakrishna Menon
15	,,	Ponnara G. Sreedhar
16	,,	K. Ramakrishnan Achari
17	,,	A. K. Patchu Pillai
18	,,	K. Ramachandran
19	,,	C. C. Prasad
20	,,	P. S. Natraja Pillai
21	,,	A. Easwara Pillai
22	,,	A. P. Nambiar
23	,,	K. Balakrishna Menon

NOES—39

1	Sri.	Alexander Vakayil
2	,,	Krishnan Ayyappan
3	,,	P. Balakrishnan Tampi
4	,,	N. V. Chacko
5	,,	P. Chacko
6	Hon. Sri.	G. Chandrasekhara Pillai
7	Sri.	Cheladi Rowther
8	Dr.	M. O. Cheriyan
9	Sri.	Ambat Eachara Menon
10	,,	Eapen Arakkal
11	,,	A. K. George
12	,,	P. Gopalan

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

13 Sri. A. J. John
14 „ A. V. Joseph
15 „ K. S. Joseph
16 „ Joseph Mathen
17 „ V. K. Joseph
18 Hon. Sri. C. Kesavan
19 Sri. T. T. Kesavan Sastri
20 „ N. S. Kochukunju
21 Hon. Sri. K. M. Korah
22 Sri. P. Kunjukrishnan
23 „ Mankuzhi M. Madhavan
24 „ V. Madhavan
25 Sahib Bahadur K. A. Muhammed
26 Sri. P. Nanoo
27 „ C. Narayana Pillai
28 „ P. K. Paul
29 „ Paul Thaliath
30 „ Paulose Pylee
31 „ Philipose Muthalaly
32 Hon. Sri. L. M. Pylee
33 Sri. Sankaran Nadar
34 „ K. Sekhara Panicker
35 „ A. P. Sivaramakrishnan
36 „ Swamiappa Kounden
37 „ A. P. Udayabhanu
38 „ Varghese Augustin
39 „ N. P. Varghese

NEUTRALS—3

1 Sri. Raphael J. Rodriguez
2 Sry. Annie Mascarene
3 Sri. K. R. Elankath

Mr. Speaker: I shall put this clause to vote after disposing of the other clauses.

Clause 2

Mr. Speaker: There is no amendment to clause 2.

The question that clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: Sir, I move.

"In clause 3, substitute the words 'one thousand five hundred' for the words 'seven hundred' wherever those words occur."

The amended clause would then read thus: "There shall be paid to each Minister a salary of one thousand five hundred rupees per mensem and dearness allowance at such rates as officers of Government drawing a salary of one thousand five hundred rupees per mensem shall be entitled to from time to time."

One of the Congress ideals is the ideal of a low paid administrator. This idea was dinned into our head long before the Congress assumed the reins of Government, and the maximum pay was fixed as Rs. 500 per mensem. This was made with all the zeal of a missionary spirit and it looks a very grand idea, and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

quite acceptable. The Britisher was blamed for creating a large number of magnificently paid posts with the idea of draining the wealth of the country and the present Home Minister of the Union Government, Sri. C. Rajagopalachariar, was loudest in this group and in fact he started with Rs. 500 as Prime Minister of Madras. That was at a time when he remained an idealist, but functioning now in high offices for some time, he and his colleagues are now receiving a few thousands of rupees per mensem. It is always well worth to remember that persons speak like angels but they live like men. Sir, I want to point out that this idea of low pay is an infant idea in the realm of practical politics, as can be seen from the reports of proceedings of a large number of Legislative Bodies. In fact every Legislature started with this idea. The necessity for an enhanced pay is now being felt all over the country. I recently had the occasion to read a book entitled "Legislative Assemblies" by Bruce. There, a chapter is devoted to salaries and allowances of Ministers. It is a very interesting reading. This controversy was one which was going on in several legislative assemblies, and this ideal of low pay has long since been abandoned by every legislative assembly. Without profiting by the lessons of history, we are trying to start back from the lowest stages and go through all the stages and perhaps we will also at some future date go up to Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 1,500. That is why I am moving this amendment. The conclusion reached by the author whose book I just now mentioned, after considering the various resolutions and discussions that had taken place in the various legislative assemblies, is that the reorganization of our legislatures should be accompanied by the payment of salaries sufficient to command the ablest men in the State. The author further says that the present rates of salaries apart of course from allowances and other emoluments—are niggardly especially in respect of those to whom is entrusted the safety and welfare of the State. A low paid official whether he be a Minister, officer, clerk or legislator is a menace to society. It is a folly to entrust underpaid men with the affairs of the nation. This is the opinion of many eminent men. We are imposing upon the Ministers and the Speaker the responsibility of the adminstration of the State. I do not think anybody seriously thinks that a Minister can live honourably with Rs. 700. The low-paid officer is a real menace to society. There is bound to be a lot of short circuit and a lot of room for bribes also.

Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair: Is it the suggestion of the hon. Member that the present Ministers are of that type because they are getting a low salary?

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: I do not say that. But my hon. friend will undoubtedly be aware that such allegations are being made now, though they may not be true. Personally I believe that Rs. 700 is too low a salary in the present day. It is a folly to entrust men with the affairs of a nation and to pay them niggardly. In this connection, I want to bring to the attention of the House the conversation which ex-Minister Mr. A. J. John had at Bangalore with Mr. Justice Mahajan, a Judge of the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Mahajan asked Mr. John what the pay of a High Court Judge in Travancore-Cochin is and he answered Rs. 1,000. "Does he then take bribes?" asked Mr. Justice Mahajan. This was the first question he put to Mr. John on hearing of the low salary. Then the talk turned on to Ministers' salaries. Therefore I am only asking the House to look at the question dispassionately. At present there seems to be some prejudice against the present incumbents of the posts of Ministers. The pay is for the office and personalites do not come into the picture at all. There may be a feeling at present that the people now in office do not deserve more. But such feelings should not stand in the way of our doing the proper thing in the matter.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri D. Gnanasigamoni]

Again I find that the pay is generally low here. Look at the chances of the employees of the Accountant General in the next compound. The lowest paid clerk there gets in all about Rs. 140. A similarly placed better qualified clerk here gets only Rs. 60 in all. And the clerk here has the same qualifications, if not better. Therefore what we find is that the officers here are getting only half the salary of clerks outside. So my submission is that instead of draining away all the revenues of our State into the coffers of the Centre and leaving our people to nurse their grievances in silence, let us think seriously and double the pay all round. We should not judge this question with any prejudiced view of things obtaining just at present. The pay is for that office. Personalities do not come in the picture at all.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: May I ask my friend what according to him should be the satisfactory minimum pay in Public Service?

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: To me it appears that for a bachelor Rs. 50 may do. With a sum lower than that it would be impossible to eke out one's living.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: So Rs. 50 is sufficient for a bachelor?

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: That is what I feel. But of course, circumstance may differ. But so far as the Government are concerned, they must have it as a policy that their servants shall be paid well lest they fall into unsatisfactory ways.

It is also one of the principles of State policy that the State shall endeavour towards securing equal pay for equal work. It applies equally for men and women. Therefore it appears to me that it is time that we lay aside personal prejudices about any particular incumbent and consider this question dispassionately from the standpoint of good and sound administration of the country. Then no other conclusion is possible than to double the pay all round and hence this amendment.

Sri. K. M. Korah: I oppose the amendment. The salary proposed in the Bill is the very same salary which the Ministers and the Speaker are getting at present. In determining this question, we have to take into consideration the salaries and allowances obtaining in other Provinces and at the Centre. And it was after taking all these aspects into consideration that this amount was finally decided upon.

Further it may not be advisable to make any changes now. If at all any change is considered desirable it may be considered after the elections. At the same time, I want to assure the hon. Member and the House that with this salary we are perfectly satisfied and that we will not resort to any malpractices, which the Member gently suggested, though not directly. With that assurance I oppose the amendment.

Sri. K. Sivarama Pillai: Under the existing rules, are the Ministers entitled to Dearness Allowance?

Sri. K. M. Korah: They are.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: Will the hon. Minister accept it if a provision is made in this Bill that this Act would come into force after the dissolution of this Assembly?

Sri. K. M. Korah: The hon. Member, I hope, will concede that it would be better to leave the matter to the next Assembly.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I am very glad to see that Mr. Gnanasigamoni spoke without the usual cant which characterises his talk. Rs. 500 was supposed

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to be a sacred amount by a very influential political party of India when India was governed by a foreign power.....

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: May I know the party to which Rs. 500 was sacred?

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: The Congress Party, when they were agitating against the Britisher thought it a very virtuous thing for an hon. Minister to work on Rs. 500. It had propaganda value at that time. As against the luxuriously living white man, there was the Indian tyagi.....

Sahib Bahadur K. A. Muhammed: Is the hon. Member referring to the Deputy Minister in the Centre?

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: No, I am using the word as a common noun. They were at that time prepared to work with that salary. But since then with scant regard to Congress ideals, international affairs have changed the money values and at the present time Rs. 500 is not sufficient even for a clerk.

Sri. R. K. Ram: May I know whether the hon. Member will be satisfied if he is allowed to file vakalaths also?

Sri. K. S. Joseph: Sir, that is an insinuation against advocates.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: There is no insinuation in that, Sir. It arises out of ignorance. I am glad that the hon. Member asked that question. The cheap press or rather the nod press and some cheap, street corner politicians are thinking that to practise on statutory matters before the authorities like the Ministers is something *infra dig*. On the other hand, I can assure the House that only people who are particularly qualified, who have been allowed by the Bar Council, can get vakalaths and have a very good time also. Let me tell friends like my hon. friend at least for the benefit of their children, that they should train their children in law, so that they may get vakalaths and make money. It is not every fool that can become an efficient lawyer. I am looking for that ex-Minister who also put that question to me.

Sri. R. K. Ram: Is the hon. Member aware that he has been held responsible in cases of misappropriation?

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: He is a client of mine now. Well, I have lost my track. A third-rate lawyer, who appears with a brief, or even a man who misappropriates, is in a much better position in life than most other people.

Now, about the Ministers. In order to attract the very best type of people, men with the requisite qualification, men who are not mucks, this Bill here makes provision, and not for the time being but for all time. Therefore I think that it is better for the House to consider the possibilities of accepting the very wise suggestion that has been brought before the House by Mr. Gnanasigamoni. I am led to disbelieve the Biblical quotation for the present: "Nothing comes from the Nazarath." Now some good has come from the Opposition Benches after all. It is better that we accept that. And let us say to the world we are paying our Ministers well. Let us set this example for the other States also. In a democracy there is no question of hiding anything from the people. Our Ministers must take high salaries and do conscientious work instead of getting starvation wages and being expected to do their work well. The social position of the hon. Ministers involves very great expenditure. And therefore is it not a shame that a Minister is not able to get on well even when he is in office?. In this connection, I may mention that there is a big fund collected in the House of Commons voluntarily from the Members to avoid an ex-Member of the House going to the Poor House or to the streets. A small pension is ensured for a Member who becomes so impecunious.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri P. Balakrishnan Tampi]

When this is what happens in Parliament, is it not but right that our Ministers should get at least living wages?. This Rs. 1,500 suggested by Mr. Gnanasigamoni, considering the present value of money, should be equal to Rs. 500 of the pre-war days. Therefore I appeal to the Treasury Benches to explore the possibility of reconsidering the matter and accept the very wise suggestion put forward by the opposition. And I admire the chivalry and the sense of fairplay which I often miss from the other quarters of the House, evidenced by Mr. Gnanasigamoni of the Tamil Nad Congress Party.

Sri. Eapen Arakkal: I also wish to support Mr. Gnanasigamoni, though I would not go the length that he would go. The Bill has been introduced, I understand, because the Centre wants some kind of statutory provision in the matter.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: May I know from the hon. Member whether there was any instruction from the Central Government on this matter.

Sri. Eapen Arakkal: If I remember aright I think this Bill was introduced on the basis of some suggestion or direction from the Central Government. That is what I understand from the objects given in the Bill. Anyway I am not very seriously concerned with that.

The Bill, coming as it does from the official side, cannot be expected to contain any suggestion for changes in the salaries existing now. That is why the present salaries have been retained in the Bill. Coming as it does from the official side, it is no wonder that no change has been made. I also very clearly understand the spirit in which the hon. Minister Sri. Korah opposed the amendment. I understand the spirit of modesty and humility manifest there. At the same time I would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that Rs. 700 today is not what it was worth some years ago. In view of the abnormal rise in the cost of living, in view of the heavy expenditure involved nowadays, Rs. 700 is but a pittance, when we think of the exalted position which the hon. Ministers and the Speaker are to hold. This small amount of Rs. 700 cannot even meet fully the requirements of an ordinary family man. If that be so, why should we fight shy when the question of enhancing the salary of the Ministers comes up for discussion? If I remember things well, the hon. Ministers were receiving Rs. 750 at the beginning of this Assembly. Sometime after the commencement of this Assembly, due to reasons unknown to us—rather I should say for reasons known to us—there was a reduction of Rs. 50 in the salaries of the Ministers and the Speaker. Of course, that is to be considered as a voluntary surrender, as a noble gesture on the part of the Ministers. Yet, however admirable, however laudable, the motives may be, the plain fact remains, that this small amount, as I have already stated, can never meet the expenses of the Ministers.

Looking at the question from another point of view, we have to keep in mind that the Ministers and the Speaker have to maintain the dignity of their office and live in a way befitting that office. From that standpoint, this amount is far short. Therefore my view is, though I would not go so far as Mr. Gnanasigamoni as to suggest the raising of the salaries to Rs. 1,500 a month, this Rs. 700 is too low and that it should be raised substantially in order to enable the Ministers and the Speaker to live in a way befitting their position. I may also suggest that the Daily Allowance allowed to them while travelling is raised to the level of the D. A. of the hon. Members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. An amendment in regard to that matter has been tabled by Mr. Udayabhanu.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sri. Eapen Arakkal: I am only suggesting that *inter alia*. That also may be self-sacrifice. But how far self-sacrifice can be reconciled to practical life has to be considered. It is not to please anyone that I say we must consider realities and see that this Rs. 700 is a very small sum.

Another thing also I wish to point out here. This legislation is to be effected towards the close of the present Assembly. The additional advantages that accrue from such enhancement are not going to be ours for a very long time. The hon. Ministers and the Speaker who are going to succeed us are really the persons to be benefited by this provision. Therefore we will be absolved from the possible change that we are trying to enhance our own salaries. Therefore we can very boldly say that we legislated like this only because it seemed to us the right thing to do.

Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair: Is the hon. Member aware that retrospective effect is to be given to this Bill, so that this will benefit even the Ministers who have gone out?

Sri. Eapen Arakkal: I did not notice it. But even then it is not going to make any difference. The need is great. Therefore I support Mr. Gnanasigamoni.

Sri. N. Daniel Jose: I strongly oppose this amendment. It is very interesting to see Congress Members shedding tears over the Ministers' receiving Rs. 700 plus a residence plus a car and other amenities. I do not say that this is a fabulously large sum. But we have to compare the salaries of the Ministers with the conditions of the people. This is a very poor country. The average income of the Indian is two or 2½ annas. Now the Members have been arguing that the hon. Ministers are not able to buy even their rations and keep up their dignity with the small salary of Rs. 700. I would have appreciated very much if the Congress Members had clamoured for raising the salary of the underpaid N. G. Os. or the teachers or the other workers in this country. It was pointed out by the Members of the Congress ranks, that the value of the rupee has gone down very much. But that applies not only to the salaries of the hon. Ministers but also to the salaires of the underpaid working classes and the N. G. Os. and the teachers. Then why do you argue that the salaries of the Ministers must be raised three times, and why do you not argue that the pay of the working people should be raised three times? I appreciate the foresight with which the hon. Minister opposed this amendment. He is fully aware that he is going to face the elections very soon....

Sri. K. M. Korah: That was not my object.

Sri. N. Daniel Jose: I am prepared to accept the statement of the hon. Minister. Well, there may be other reasons which prompted the hon. Minister in opposing it. But I want to point out that no case has been made out by the hon. Member who moved the amendment for raising the salaries of the Ministers. If they are to raise the salaries of the hon. Ministers, then are they going to raise the salaries of the small officials, the Secretariat staff, the N. G. Os. and the teachers? You cannot build up dignity out of money alone. Mahatma Gandhi lived in a small hut; he lived on a small amount, but did that mean that Mahatma Gandhi lost anything by way of dignity? If the Ministers today have failed in their mission, it is because in their newly-found luxuries, they have lost all contact with the masses of the country. They have moved away from the people. They go about in cars; they have good houses to live in, and already I suspect they are beginning to feel that they belong to a higher section apart from the masses. That, Sir, is the great failure of the Congress in India. I am giving expression not only to my views on this but I am expressing the view also of the Ex-President of the Indian National Congress Sri. Acharya Kripalini.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sahib Bahadur T. A. Abdulla: Does the hon. Member know that Sri. Jaiprakash Narain is drawing a fat salary and allowance from the Railway Advisory Board?

Sri. N. Daniel Jose: I do not know whether Sri. Jaip rakash Narain is drawing a fat allowance from the Railway Board. This much I know that he is living a simple life.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: Will the hon. Member be satisfied and prepared to raise the salary of Ministers if the salary of the N. G. Os. is raised?

Sri. N. Daniel Jose: If the salaries and the general living standards can be raised at least three times the rates which existed before the war that is 500 to 1,500, if you can raise the standard of living by three times of the prewar days nobody can have any objection to raising the salary of the Ministers.

My hon. friend was referring to the inadequacy of the salaries. I am sure Sir, that he was not thinking of a country like India. He was admittedly referring to countries like America, Britain and other foreign countries where the standard of living is definitely higher. Now since the name of the Socialist Party has been brought in by my hon. friend I would put it that it is the definite policy of the Socialist Party that the lowest income in India should be Rs. 100 and the highest should not exceed Rs. 1,000.

Sir, it has been pointed out that if Rs. 750 is paid you will not be able to have the best men available. It is for the electorate to decide who are the best men. Sir, several reasons can be adduced against this amendment which has been moved, but I do not think, Sir, that it is necessary. It is very obvious to any person in this country that this amendment is highly out of place in a country like ours.

ശ്രീ. ഇ. ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ: സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ജനങ്ങൾക്ക് അനേകായിരം കാര്യങ്ങൾ നേടിക്കൊടുക്കാമെന്നു വാഗ്ദാനം ചെയ്തുകൊണ്ട് നിയമസഭയിലേക്ക് തെരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ഇവിടത്തെ ബഹു. മെമ്പറന്മാർക്കും മന്ത്രിമാർക്കും സാധാരണക്കാരുടെ ജീവിത നിലവാരം അല്പംപോലും വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ഇതുവരെ കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. ആ നിലക്ക് മന്ത്രിമാരുടേയും ബഹു. സ്പീക്കറുടേയും നിയമസഭാംഗങ്ങളുടേയും ശമ്പളവും അലവൻസും ഇനിയും വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട് ശക്തിയായി വാദിക്കുന്നതു കേൾക്കുമ്പോൾ എനിക്ക് ചിരിയാണ് വരുന്നതു്. ഇവിടെയുള്ള മന്ത്രിമാർ ഒരോ രൂപ ശമ്പളവും കാറും മറ്റു അലവൻസുകളും വാങ്ങുന്നതു പോരെന്നും അവർക്ക് അന്തസ്സായി ജീവിക്കാൻ ഇതു പര്യാപ്തമാകുന്നില്ലെന്നും തോന്നുന്നു. പ്രധാനമായി വാദിക്കപ്പെട്ടതു്. എന്റെ ബഹു. സ്നേഹിതൻ ശ്രീ. എൻ. ഡി. ജോസ് പ്രസ്താവിച്ചതുപോലെ ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ഭൂരിപക്ഷം വരുന്ന സാധാരണക്കാരന്റെ ജീവിതനിലവാരം എന്താണെന്നുള്ളതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഈ വാദം പറഞ്ഞുവയ്ക്കുന്ന മെമ്പറന്മാർക്കെങ്കിലും ബോധമുണ്ടോ എന്നാണ് ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നതു്. ഇവിടത്തെ തൊഴിലാളികളുടേയും കുറഞ്ഞ ശമ്പളക്കാരുടേയും അതുപോലെ ദുരിതം അനുഭവിക്കുന്ന ഇടത്തരക്കാരുടേയും ജീവിതത്തോടു് അല്പമെങ്കിലും ഉയർത്തുന്നതിനു കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ലാത്ത ഒരു പരിതഃസ്ഥിതിയിൽ മന്ത്രിമാരുടേയും മറ്റും ശമ്പളംമാത്രം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതു് ജനങ്ങളോടു ചെയ്യുന്ന വലിയ അനീതിയായിരിക്കും. ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ ശരാശരി വരുമാനം രണ്ടര അണയാണെന്നാണ് കാണുന്നതു്. ഇതനുസരിച്ചു നോക്കുമ്പോൾ സ്പീക്കർക്കും മന്ത്രിമാർക്കും ഇപ്പോൾ നിശ്ചയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ശമ്പ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ളം എത്രയുംഉയർന്നതാണ്. ഇവിടെ ഉടനടി ചെയ്തുതീർക്കേണ്ട എത്രയോ അധികം കാര്യങ്ങളുണ്ട്. അരി വാങ്ങുവാൻ ബഡ്ജറ്റിൽ പണമില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് അരിയുടെ വില ഇനിയും വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ആലോചിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കയാണ്. ൨ ൫ രൂപ ശമ്പളം വാങ്ങി അദ്ധ്വാനിയും അവശതയുമായി കഴിഞ്ഞുകൂടുന്ന അദ്ധ്യാപകന്മാരുടെ ശമ്പളവും ക്ഷാമബത്തയും വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനു പണമില്ലെന്നാണ് പറയുന്നത്. അങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കെ മന്ത്രിമാരുടേയും സ്പീക്കറുടേയും ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിൽ എന്തു ന്യായമാണുള്ളതെന്ന് എനിക്ക് മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല.

ശ്രീ. ഈപ്പൻ അറയ്ക്കൽ: സഖാവ് സ്റ്റാലിനു് റഷ്യയിൽ കൊടുക്കുന്ന ശമ്പളം എന്താണെന്നറിയാമോ?

ശ്രീ. ഇ. ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ: ശമ്പളം എന്തായിരുന്നാലും അതു അവിടത്തെ ഒരു തൊഴിലാളിക്കു കിട്ടുന്ന വരുമാനത്തിൽനിന്നും വളരെ വ്യത്യാസമുള്ളതായിരിക്കുകയില്ല.

ശ്രീ. ഈപ്പൻ അറയ്ക്കൽ: പ്രതിമാസം ൫൨, ൦ ൦ ൦ രൂപയാണ് സ്റ്റാലിന്റെ ശമ്പളമെന്നു അറിയാമോ?

ശ്രീ. ഇ. ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ: അങ്ങനെങ്കിൽ അവിടത്തെ തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കുള്ള വരവും അതിനു അനുസരണമായി വർദ്ധിച്ചതന്നെ ഇരിക്കും. സാമ്പത്തികവും സാമൂഹ്യവും രാഷ്ട്രീയവുമായി വളരെ അധികം ഉയർത്തപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ജനതയെ സൃഷ്ടിക്കാൻ കഴിയുന്ന റഷ്യയുമായി ഒരു കാര്യത്തിലും നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യം താരതമ്യപ്പെടുത്താതിരിക്കുകയാണ് നല്ലതു്. ഇൻഡ്യയിലെ ജീവിതത്തോടുപോലെ കുറഞ്ഞ ഒരു ജീവിതത്തോടു് ഒരു രാജ്യത്തും കാണുകയില്ല.

ശ്രീ. സി. കേശവൻ: കമ്യൂണിസ്റ്റ് നേതാക്കന്മാരും, സോഷ്യലിസ്റ്റ് നേതാക്കന്മാരും മറ്റും സഞ്ചരിക്കുമ്പോൾ ഒന്നാംതരം കാറുകളിൽ സഞ്ചരിക്കുന്നതു ജീവിതത്തോടു നോക്കിയാണോ?

ശ്രീ. ഇ. ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ: കാറുകളിൽ സഞ്ചരിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യം അവർക്കും ഒന്നുമില്ല. എന്നാൽ എത്രയും കഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടു ജീവിക്കുവാനും അവർ തയ്യാറാണ്.

ശ്രീ. എ. കെ. ജോഷ്വാ: ഇവർക്കു മാസ്സിന്റെ ഹോട്ടലിൽപോയി താമസിക്കണമെന്നുണ്ടോ?

ശ്രീ. ഇ. ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണമേനോൻ: ആരാണ് മാസ്സിന്റെ ഹോട്ടലിൽപോയി താമസിച്ചതെന്ന് എനിക്ക് അറിവില്ല. ഏതായാലും മന്ത്രിമാരുടേയും സ്പീക്കറുടേയും മറ്റും ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിൽ ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ അഭിലാഷവും ജീവിതരീതിയും അറിയാവുന്ന, ജനങ്ങളുടെ താല്പര്യത്തെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കുന്ന മെമ്പറന്മാർ ആരുംതന്നെ യോജിക്കയില്ലെന്നും അവർ അതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുമെന്നും ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

Sry. Annie Mascarene: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment. I am sorry that the speakers who have been supporting the motion have never had the experience of a Minister. The idea that they got only Rs. 700 is a mistake. I remember to have received Rs. 900 and odd every month—Rs. 700. puls Rs. 150 for petrol allowance, plus Rs. 50 dearness allowance and daily allowance. These allowances sometimes come to Rs. 1,000. That is as far as the money received is concerned. There is the car, there is the driver, a retinue of servants, a dignified

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sry. Annie Mascarene]

house with its establishments, etc., etc. The representatives of the people who have to stand and serve the cause of those who live in misery and in needs and necessities.—

Sri. A. K. George: One question, did the hon. Member ever protest?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Sri. A. K. George: Did she ever protest?

Sry. Annie Mascarene: I yield not to him.

Sir, the present situation that is demanding the attention of the Ministert and leaders of society and politics is not the question of this sor, but a question of the misery of the people, the poverty of the people. We are not able to feed and clothe the masses. We have no hope of self-sufficiency The Ministers must live a life as the country demands, as the country can afford. As I have experienced, they can live with lesser amount than the amount that they are actually receiving as Ministers today. After visiting the hospitals and after visiting the different parts of the State, I see that there is no food for the masses and there is nothing to wear and nobody to help the poor. We have to consider the cause of masses first. We have to consider the position of the patients in the hospitals, etc. Is it before we can consider these that we should make the Ministers more comfortable? If the salaries of the Ministers are not sufficient, I heard some of the speakers say, that they are prone to be corrupt. Mr. Speaker, corruption is a quality which will exercise itself, even if you give them Rs. 1,000. That is a quality which is inherent in itself that will exercise itself. Therefore it is not the comfort of the Ministers that should receive our attention. It is with regard to their honesty and their service that we should give our attention and as Members of the House we should give them necessary help and give them timely advice and help to go straight in the path of duty. What we have got to do and instead of saying that their salary should be raised, it is our duty as Members of this House and as representatives of the people to help the Ministers and to advise them and to show them they must live with the emoluments that they now get and that they should not expect more from the poor.

Sir, as a Member of the Legislature and as a Member of the once-upon a time Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

The House rose for lunch at 1 p.m. and re-assembled at 2 p.m. with Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Point of Order *re*-Answers to Unstarred Questions.

2 p. m.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: Sir, I want to raise a point of order. The usual practice here is that as soon as the starred questions are answered, the answers to the unstarred questions are to be placed on the table. Today it was not done. We have raised this question more than once here. I would like you to give directions to the office to make the answers available punctually.

Mr. Speaker: If the answers are not already placed on the table, I will ask the hon. Minister in charge to place them on the Table as soon as possible.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: But the difficulty is this. We do not know when they are available and when not.

Sri. C. Kesavan: It is usually placed on the table punctually. But today the clerk happened to take them back to the office.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sry. Annie Mascarene : Before, I go on with my speech, I also wish to raise a point of order, with regard to the answer made by the Chief Minister. On the 17th I was on the look out for the answers for the day. They have not come to me as yet. We are in need of these answers.

Sri. C. Kesavan : May I inform the hon. Member that they were placed on the table in the afternoon ?

Sry. Annie Mascarene : Sir, I looked into them, and found that of the questions posted for the day, only 38 were answered.

Mr. Speaker : The hon. Minister informs us that all the answers were placed. I would request the hon. Member to look into the matter once again.

Sry. Annie Mascarene : I asked the officers to give me the answers and they gave me answers for only 38 questions. That is the honest truth.

Sri. C. Kesavan : 38 questions? May I know whether you mean starred questions or unstarred questions?

Sry. Annie Mascarene : Starred questions, please.

Sri. C. Kesavan : Answers to all starred questions have been placed on the table.

Sry. Annie Mascarene : I am still saying that they have not come to me as yet. Well, I hope I will meet with better success next time.

The Travancore-Cochin Payment of Salaries and Allowances Bill—(*Cont.*)

Clause 3

Sry. Annie Mascarene : Well, I was dealing with the salaries of the Ministers. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Members of this House to the way in which I spent my salary when I was a Minister. Though I was an unmarried person, I was living with three members of my family, plus two servants and I was entertaining guests. Yet I was able to put by Rs. 500 every month and deposit with the Imperial Bank of India. If any hon. Member here wants to verify the truth, my accounts are at his disposal. I was able to dress well, I was able to eat well and see that those who were attached to me also got on well. And I was on circuit almost every day of my tenure of office. Of course, I could not eat much more as Minister than I used to before, I could not wear more clothes; all the necessities were just the same as before. But I can tell the Members here that I lived more comfortably and more decently than I used to do, and I was able to entertain guests which I would not otherwise have been able to do. And with all these expenses, I was able to put by Rs. 500 every month, which would have gone to meet the expenditure of a married man. If any Member is anxious he can verify the accounts.

But it is not the luxury of the Ministers, it is the need, the comfort, the daily necessities of the man-in-the-street that we are worried with. His neck is already broken with the burden of supporting five Ministers of the State. Calculating the expenses and cost of maintaining a Minister,—I was able to go through the accounts as a Minister—they would come to Rs. 3,000 a month, with all the Personal Clerks, and Private Secretaries and Peons and all the other paraphernalia of a Minister. And that was one of the reasons why I resigned from the Ministry. Four of us got off on that account.

Sri. C. Kesavan : May I know from the hon. Member whether it was because of the luxurious life that the hon. Member was forced to live that the hon. Member resigned?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sry. Annie Mascarene : Knowing that the needs of the country, the financial position of the country needed retrenchment, how can a Minister continue in his position. Therefore as a financial measure, and in order to set an example to others, we resigned. That is the reason put down.

Then it was nine, and the expenditure was 9 × 3, *i. e.*, 27 thousand rupees. Now it is 5×3. We were grudging to pay Rs. 5,000 to Sir C. P. and felt that it was a large sum. But what is the position now? I am told that Stalin lives rather luxuriously. I happened to read a book on his life. It is true that he lives in a palatial house. But he occupies only three rooms, one his bedroom, another his office room and the third, his wife's room. His wife is to confine herself to her room. And he gets his meals from the general mess as any other comrade does. And that is why through the last 27 years he continues to be the leading personality in Russia and every year the people elect him because of the simplicity of his living and his sympathy for the working people. I am not advocating such austerity here. But the average man here cannot afford to pay more than Rs. 700 to the Ministers. He is weak, he has not got food. He has not got clothes. Do you seek to burden him with another Rs. 1,500? Popular administration means sympathy for the poor, co-operation with the poor, live like the poor, raise their standard. If the administation of India can make India self-supporting at least in food, I have no objection in giving Ministers Rs. 1,500. But whore are we? We have heard the Ministers say that if the Centre would not give the subsidy, they would resign. Why do they say that? It is their sense of responsibility that made them say that. So today our question is not to increase the salaries of the Ministers. The burning problem of the day is to solve the food problem and the cloth problem and to see that the administration is not abused. That is our duty ; not to please Ministers by increasing their salaries. They themselves say they do not want it and that they are quite satisfied with the present salaries. Therefore I oppose this amendment with all my strength. I would request the Members of this House to consider the step they are taking.

Sri. A. Chidambaranatha Nadar : The hon. Member said that when she was a Minister she was able to save Rs. 500 a month. Why did not the hon. Member place the Rs. 500 at the disposal of the public?

Sry. Annie Mascarene : I do not require your advice on the subject.

ശ്രീ. സി. വി. ഇയ്യു: മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടുന്ന കാര്യത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ള ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ പരാമർശിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ഒരു മന്ത്രിയായിരുന്ന കുമാരി മസ്ക്രീനും മറ്റും പ്രസംഗിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. അവർ പറഞ്ഞു മന്ത്രിയായിരുന്നപ്പോൾ അവർക്ക് ഏകദേശം അഞ്ഞൂറ് രൂപാവീതം പ്രതിമാസം സമ്പാദ്യം ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ട് മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ലെന്നുമാണ്. എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം മന്ത്രിമാർക്ക് ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടിയാൽ അവർ മനുഷ്യജീവികളിൽനിന്നും വ്യത്യസ്തമായ ഒരു ജീവിയാണെന്ന വിചാരം അവർക്ക് വന്നുപോകുമെന്നാണ്. അങ്ങിനെയാണ് ഇവിടെ കണ്ടുവരുന്നത്. ശമ്പളവും സൗജന്യങ്ങളുമായി ജീവിക്കുന്നതിനപ്പുറത്തേക്ക് മറ്റു സൗകര്യങ്ങളും എല്ലാംകൂടി കിട്ടിയിട്ട് മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനത്തുനിന്നും പുറത്തുവരുമ്പോൾ മറ്റുള്ള മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെകൂടെ ഇരിക്കുന്നതിനോ അവരുമായി സംസാരിക്കുന്നതിനോ എക്സ് മന്ത്രിമാർക്ക് ഒരു പോരായ്മ ഉള്ളതുപോലെ തോന്നുന്നുണ്ട്. ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മുൻ മന്ത്രിമാരെ ഒഴിച്ചു ബാക്കിയുള്ളവരാരുംതന്നെ, ഉദാഹരണമായി, ശ്രീ. പട്ടം താണുപിള്ളയെപ്പോലെയുള്ള ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ പേരൊഴിച്ചു; ബാക്കിയുള്ളവരാരുംതന്നെ സമാനപദവികളിൽ തരിയായി പങ്കെടുക്കുന്നതായി കാണുന്നില്ല. മി. താണുപിള്ള അ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

സംബളി നടപടികളിൽ മുഴുവനംതന്നെ പങ്കെടുക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. മി. അച്യുതനും അതുപോലെതന്നെയാണ്. മറുള്ളവർ അസംബ്ളിയിൽ വരുകപോലും ചെയ്യുന്നില്ല. അഥവാ വന്നാൽതന്നെയും വല്ല മൂലയിലും ചെന്നിരുന്ന് കഴിച്ചുകൂട്ടുകയാണ് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് അവരുടെ ശമ്പളം തിച്ചുയായും കൂട്ടാൻ പാടില്ല. എനിക്കു് ഒരു അഭിപ്രായമുണ്ടു്, മി. മൈതീൻകുഞ്ഞു പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ രണ്ടോ മൂന്നോ മാസത്തേക്കു് കുറെപ്പേരെവീതം ഷിഫ്റ്റ് സിസ്റ്റം അനുസരിച്ചു മന്ത്രിയാക്കി തിരിയെ അയക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ തങ്ങളിൽ പിന്നെ Superiority Complex കാണുകയില്ല. എല്ലാവക്കും മന്ത്രിപദം കിട്ടും എന്നാകുമ്പോൾ അവിശ്വാസപ്രമേയവും ഉണ്ടാവുകയില്ല. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ നിലയിൽ മന്ത്രിമാക്കു് ശമ്പളമില്ലെങ്കിൽപോലും സുഖലോലുപന്മാരായി ജീവിക്കാം. വേണമെങ്കിൽ മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനം കിട്ടുന്നതിനു അങ്ങോട്ടേക്കു ധാരാളം രൂപ കൊടുക്കുവാനും തയ്യാറുണ്ടു്. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഇത്രയൊക്കെ സൗകര്യം ഉണ്ടെന്നു കണ്ടതുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഞങ്ങളിൽ കുറെയാളുകളും ഇങ്ങോട്ടുവരുവാൻ തീരുമാനിച്ചതു്. കൊച്ചിയിൽ ആദ്യം മന്ത്രി ഉണ്ടായപ്പോൾ ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടുവാൻ ഞാനാണു് ഉത്സാഹിച്ചതു്. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോൾ അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്യുന്നതു തെറ്റാണെന്നാണു് എനിക്കു് തോന്നുന്നതു്. ഇവിടെ ഒരു മുൻമന്ത്രി പറഞ്ഞു റിട്രെഞ്ചുമെൻറു് എഫക്റ്റിൽ വരുത്തുവാൻ കൂടിയാണു് മന്ത്രിപദത്തിൽനിന്നും വിരമിച്ചതെന്നു്. എതായാലും ഇനിയും മന്ത്രിമാക്കു ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അവർ, ഞാൻ മുൻപു പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ, മനുഷ്യത്വരഹിതരായ ജീവികളായിത്തീരുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് മന്ത്രിമാക്കു് ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു ഞാൻ പരിപൂർണ്ണമായും എതിരാണു്. മഹാത്മഗാന്ധിയുടെ ആദർശങ്ങളും പറഞ്ഞിട്ടു് മന്ത്രിമാർ ജനങ്ങളെ ചൂഷണംചെയ്യുന്നു. മന്ത്രിമാർ ആയാൽ പിന്നെ.. ...

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must address the Chair.

ശ്രീ. സി. വി. ഇയ്യു: ഒരാളെ ഒരു മന്ത്രിയാക്കിയാൽ പിന്നെ അയാൾക്കു് യാതൊരു പ്രയാസവും ഇല്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു് അവരുടെ ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടി വയ്ക്കുന്നതു് അബദ്ധമാണു്. തിരുവനന്തപുരത്തുള്ള മന്ത്രിമാർ എല്ലാം അവരവരുടെ വീടുകളിൽ താമസിക്കണമെന്നാണു് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു്. മറുള്ള മന്ത്രിമാരും കഴിയുന്നതും ഇന്നത്തെ രീതിയിൽ ഗവൺമെൻറു വക കെട്ടിടങ്ങളിൽ താമസിക്കുന്നതിനായി ഓടിനടക്കരുതെ. അതുകൊണ്ടു മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ അനുകൂല്യങ്ങൾ കുറയ്ക്കുന്നതിനു് ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുകയാണു് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്.

സാഹിബു് ബഹദൂർ ടി. എ. മൈതീൻകുഞ്ഞു്: മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ശ്രീ. ഡി. ജ്ഞാനശിഖാമണി അവർകളുടെ ഭേദഗതിയെ ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കയാണു ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നതു എന്തുകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു വച്ചാൽ യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ അതു രാജ്യത്തിനു പ്രയോജനകരമായിരിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടാണു്. ഇന്നതന്നെ ഒരു രൂപായും മറുമവൻസുകളും വാങ്ങിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് സ്പീക്കറും മന്ത്രിമാരും ചെലവിനു തികയാതെ പട്ടിണികൊണ്ടും കഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടും കഴിഞ്ഞുകൂടുന്നതു കണ്ടിട്ടു് യഥാർത്ഥത്തിൽ ജനങ്ങൾ കണ്ണുനീർ പൊഴിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയാണു് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. മന്ത്രിമാർ അവരുടെ കാലാവധികഴിഞ്ഞു് പുറത്തുവരുമ്പോൾ കഴിക്കാനൊന്നുമില്ലാതെയും മറും വളരെ വിഷമിക്കുകയാണു് ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. മന്ത്രിമാക്കു് ഇവിടെ ജീവിക്കാൻ സാധ്യമല്ലെങ്കിൽ പിന്നെ എങ്ങനെയാണു് രാജ്യം നന്നാകുന്നതു്. അങ്ങിനെയൊരു അവസ്ഥയാണു് ഇന്നു് രാജ്യത്തു് അഭിമുഖീകരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു്

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sahib Bahadur T. A. Moideenkunju]

മന്ത്രിമാക്ക് ഒരു ₹, ൪ ൦ ൦ രൂപാ അല്ലാ ഒരു നാലോ അഞ്ചോ ലക്ഷം രൂപാ വരെ കൊടുക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതായിരിക്കും വളരെ നീതിപൂർവ്വവും. ഇവിടെ ഭരണം നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനും നല്ലതു്. ഇപ്പോൾ പണമില്ലാതെ മന്ത്രിമാർ പട്ടിണികിടക്കുന്നതിന്റെ ഫലമായിട്ടാണു് ഈ സ്ഥാനത്തേയ്ക്കു് വരാൻ യാതൊരുത്തരും ഒരുമ്പെടാത്തതു്. അങ്ങനെ ഇപ്പോൾ യാതൊരു ഔത്സുക്യവും ഇല്ലാതെയായി തീർന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇവിടെതന്നെയാണെങ്കിൽ മന്ത്രിസഭയിൽ വരാൻ ആളെ കിട്ടുന്നില്ല: അതുകൊണ്ടു്. വലിയ പ്രയാസവും ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. വലിയ ശമ്പളമുണ്ടായിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ ധാരാളം ആളുകൾ അതിനുവേണ്ടി ഇങ്ങോട്ടു വരുമായിരുന്നു. അതുകൊണ്ടു് മന്ത്രിമാർക്കു് ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടി കൊടുക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള മാതിരി വിഷമം നേരിടുകയില്ലായിരുന്നു.

ഇന്നു് ഇവിടെയുള്ള വേറെ ചിലർ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി ഇവിടെ ഭക്ഷ്യധാന്യങ്ങൾക്കു് വില വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ പോകുന്നുവെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു് മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതു് ശരിയല്ലേയെന്നും. ഇന്നു് ഈ മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ സ്ഥാനങ്ങൾ ഓരോന്നായിട്ടു ലേലം വിളിച്ചു നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ നമുക്കു യഥാർത്ഥസ്ഥിതി മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ കഴിയുന്നതാണു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് എനിക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു് ഈ മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ സ്ഥാനങ്ങൾക്കു് ആകർഷണീയത വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നാണു്. ഇപ്പോൾ ഇത്ര കുറഞ്ഞ ആദായമായതുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഇന്നു പല അക്രമങ്ങളും മന്ത്രിമാർതന്നെ ബ്ലാക്കുമാർക്കറ്റിങ്ങും മറ്റും നടത്തിവരുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് അവരുടെ ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടതനുസരിച്ചു് ശമ്പളം വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചാൽ ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ഏറ്റവും വിഷമങ്ങളായ പ്രശ്നങ്ങൾ പരിഹരിക്കുന്നതിനു സാധിക്കുന്നതാണു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഈ ഭേദഗതി പാസാക്കണമെന്നാണു് എനിക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: My friend Mr. Gnanasigamoni has moved an amendment for clause 3. "In clause 3, substitute the words "one thousand five hundred" for the words 'seven hundred' wherever those words occur." Evidently he has forgotten that clause 1 sub-clause (2) which reads thus: "Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this Act shall be deemed to have come into force on the 26th day of January 1950 and the rest of the Act shall come into force at once". Practically, if his amendment is accepted all the gentlemen who have adorned the ministerial benches on the 26th day of January 1950 and after will be entitled to get the pay at the rate of Rs. 1,500 a month. This amendment gives retrospective effect from 26th January 1950. I do not think my friend wants that. He is an efficient lawyer and I do not know how he introduced such an amendment. I think after-all his attempt is only to discuss the question what should be the remuneration for a Minister in Travancor-Cochin State. In this connection what I have to say is that we are functioning in a democracy and that this legislature has been given the right to fix the pay for the people who administer the country. At any rate this is a Legislature which came into being as a result of a covenant and thereby the constitution Act itself. This House had a right to fix the pay of Minister and it fixed it at Rs. 700. But Elections are fast approaching and then it will be the time for the country to give a verdict on this question. People may elect men like Mr. Tampi, who are leading advocates, who will have to be paid perhaps Rs. 2,500 or more or they may elect people who will be prepared to function on a lesser amount like Rs. 500 or so. That is a time, the opportunity for the people to decide this matter. Let us leave the matter for the country to decide. Therefore this House

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

need not now lay down a rule about that. Let us not leave behind a legacy for the next Legislature. As far as my personal opinion is concerned, I have the opinion that whenever we think of the rate of salaries, we should always think of the minimum, and then only of the maximum. There should not be a wide gap in society between the higher classes and the lower classes. There should be a comparatively common level of remuneration. Therefore we have to accept what will be the minimum standard and then fix the maximum and then enforce both.

Apart from these, I think the particular amendment we are now discussing is most inopportune. I feel the mover ought not to have moved this amendment.

ஸ்ரீ. ஏ. சிதம்பரநாத நாடார்: ஸர், ஸ்ரீமான் ஞானசிகாமணி அவர்களின் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்து ஒன்றிரண்டு வார்த்தைகள் பேசலாம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். மந்திரிமார்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை 1500 ரூபாய் ஆக உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்பதுதான் ஸ்ரீமான் ஞானசிகாமணி அவர்களுடைய திருத்தப் பிரேரணை. அதை எதிர்த்து குமாரி மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள், மந்திரிமார்களுக்கு அந்த அளவிலே சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்த வேண்டாமென்றும், அவர்கள் மந்திரியாக இருந்த அனுபவத்திலிருந்து அவர்களுக்கு 500 ரூபாய் சேமிக்க முடிந்ததென்றும் அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். ஆனல் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் மந்திரியாக இருந்த காலத்து தனது நிலை என்ன என்பதைப் பற்றி சிறிதேனும் சிந்தித்தாரில்லை. இன்று முக்கிய மந்திரியாக இருக்கும் ஸ்ரீமான் ஸி. கேசவன் அவர்களைப் போலவோ அல்லது ஸ்ரீமான் கே. எம். கோராவைப் போலவோ அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்களும் கல்யாண வாழ்வில் உள்பட்டு ஒருவேளை ஏழு மக்களைப் பெற்று மந்திரியாய் இருந்திருந்தால் தெரியும், மாதம் ஐநூறு ரூபாய் சேமிக்க முடியுமா இல்லையா என்று? அல்லது ஒருவேளை கல்லதங்காளாய் இருந்திருந்தால் தெரியும் 500–ரூபாய் மாதம் சேமிக்க முடியுமா முடியாதா என்று. அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்களைப் போலவே ஸ்ரீமான் இய்யு அவர்களும் சொன்னார்கள். இய்யு அவர்கள் கல்யாண வாழ்வில் ஈடுபட்டார்களே ஒழிய மக்கள் என்றால் யார் என்பதைப் பற்றி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியவராது. அங்ஙனம், தெரியாத நிலையில் அவர்களிடமிருந்து இவ்விதம் அபிப்பிராயங்களைத் தான் நாம் எதிர்பார்க்க முடியும். ஆனல், மந்திரிமார்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை 1,500 ரூபாயாக உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்று ஸ்ரீமான் ஞானசிகாமணி அவர்கள் சொன்னதை நான் ஆதரித்தாலும் அதை எதிர்த்தும் ஒன்றிரண்டு வார்த்தைகள் சொல்லாமலிருக்க முடியாது. ஸர், மந்திரிமார்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை 1500 ரூபாயாக உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்று ஒருவேளை மந்திரிமார்களும் கூட ஆசைப்பட்டாலும் அதே சமயத்தில் அவர்களின் கீழ் வேலைபார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும், தாழ்ந்த உத்தியோகங்களில் இருக்கும் என். ஜி. ஓ–க்களைப் பற்றி அதிலும் விசேஷமாக கல்வி இலாகாவில் இருக்கக்கூடிய உபாத்தியாயர்களைப் பற்றி அவர்கள் சற்று சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இன்று ஆரம்பப் பாடசாலைகளில் உத்தியோகம் வகித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும் ஒரு ஆசிரியருக்கு கிடைக்கும் சம்பளம் இருபத்தைந்து முதல் இருபத்தெட்டு ரூபாய் வரைதான். இந்த உபாத்தியாயர்களை எடுத்துப் பார்த்தால் குறைந்தது அவர்களுக்கு ஆறு குழந்தைகள் இருக்கும். நாகர்கோவிலில் இருக்கும் ஒரு உபாத்தியாயரை யெமிப்பது செங்கோட்டையிலோ, பீர்மேட்டிலோ அல்

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri. A. Chidambaranatha Nadar]

லது சிற்றாரிலோ ஆயிருக்கும். இதையொன்றும் சிந்தனை செய்துபாரா மல் உன்னை 25 முதல் 28 வரை ஸ்கேலில் நியமித்திருக்கிறோம். ஆத லால் அங்கே போய் உன் உத்தியோகத்தைப் பார் என்று சொன்னால் அ வர்கள் அவர்களது வாழ்க்கையை எப்படிச் செல்லாக்குவார்கள் என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். எனக்கு இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் என்ன படுகிறது என்று கேட்டால் இன்று மந்திரிமார்களாய் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஐந்துபேர்களும் இன்று இராத்திரியிலே புத்தரிக்கண்டம் தியேட்டரில் நடக்கக்கூடிய மண மகள் சினிமாவை போய் பாருங்கள். போய் பார்த்தால் நீங்கள் மந்திரி மார்களாய் என்ன முறையில் நடக்கவேண்டுமென்று தெரிந்துகொள்ள லாம். மந்திரிமார்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை 1,500 ரூபாயாக கூட்டவேண்டு மென்ற பிரயத்தனம் இருந்தாலும் திருவிதாங்கூர்–கொச்சி ராஜ்யத்திலு ள்ள உயர்ந்த உத்தியோகங்கள் என்று சொல்லக்கூடிய சில உத்தியோகங் களில் இருக்கும் உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களுக்கு சரியான முறையில், அவர்களு டைய நிலைக்குத் தக்கபடி சம்பளம் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை என்று எனக் குத் தெரியும். வேண்டுமானால் உதாரணங்கள் தருகிறேன். இன்று திரு விதாங்கூர்–கொச்சி ராஜ்யத்தில் அட்வக்கேட் ஜெனரல் பதவி என்பது ஒரு பெரிய பதவியாகும். இது இன்று அகில இந்தியாவில் இருக்கக்கூ டிய எல்லோராலும் அறியப்பட்ட ஒரு உத்தியோகமுமாகும். எல்லோரா லும் விசேஷமாகக் கருதக்கூடிய ஒரு உத்தியோகமும் ஆகும் அது. அந்த உத்தியோகத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அந்த நபருக்கு இன்று சம்பளம் எவ்வளவு என்று கேட்டால் சம்பளம் மிகவும் மிகவும் குறைவு. அதைப் பற்றி யாருக்கும் சிந்தனை இல்லை. பேருக்கு அட்வக்கேட் ஜெனரல் அங் கிருக்கிறார். வந்துவிடு என்று சொன்னால் எரணாகுளத்திலிருந்து பறக்கி றார். ஆனால் அவருடைய சம்பளம் எவ்வளவு என்ற சிந்தனை இந்த சர்க் காருக்கோ அல்லது இந்த மந்திரிமார்களுக்கோ வந்ததா என்று கேட் டால் இல்லை என்று தான் சொல்ல முடியும். இன்னும் ஒரு விஷயம் கூட. மந்திரிமார்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை கூட்டவேண்டும் என்பதைப் பற்றி ஒரு விஷயம் கூட சொல்ல நான் ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். இன்று மேல் நாடுகளில் மந்திரிமார்களாய் இருந்து உத்தியோகங்களிலிருந்து நீக் கம் செய்யப்பட்ட அம்மந்திரிமார்கள் மந்திரிமார்களாய் இருந்தபொழுது எவ்விதஉயர்ந்தநிலையில்அவர்கள் தங்களது வாழ்க்கையை செல்லாக்கிக்கொ ண்டுபோனார்களோஅதேபடி அதற்குப் பின்னும் தங்களது வாழ்க்கையை நீட்டிக்கொண்டு போகும் முறையிலுள்ள சௌகரியங்களை அந்தந்த சர் க்கார்கள் செய்துகொடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. இன்று நமது திருவி தாங்கூர் கொச்சியிலும் ஜனநாயக அரசாட்சி வந்த பின்னர் நம் நாட்டில் மந்திரிமார்களாய் இருந்து உத்தியோகத்திலிருந்து நீக்கம் செய்யப்பட்ட மந்திரிமார்களை இன்று ஓரளவில் நாம் பார்த்துக்கொண்டுதான் இருக்கி றோம். உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும், ஸ்ரீமான் அச்சுதன் அவர்களின் நிலை என னவென்று. ஸ்ரீமான் பட்டம் தாணுபிள்ளை அவர்களின் நிலை என்னவெ ன்று உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். ஸ்ரீமான் இலங்கத் அவர்களின் நிலை என னவென்றும் உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். இந்த நிலைமையைப் பற்றி நீங்கள் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் சொன்ன தில் எனக்கு இன்னும் ஒரு எதிர் அபிப்பிராயமுண்டு. ஒருவேளை

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

இந்தப் பிரேரணை இங்கே வந்தபோது அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் காங்கிரஸிலிருந்து.....

ശ്രീ. സി. വി. ഐയ്യു: അമ്മയാർ എന്നല്ല; കുമാരി എന്നുവേണം പറയുവാൻ.

ஸ்ரீ. ஏ. சிதம்பரநாத நாடார்: வேண்டுமானால் குமாரி என்றே சொல்கிறேன். குமாரி மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் காங்கிரஸில் இருந்திருந்தால் தனக்கு இனிமேலும் ஒரு மந்திரியாவதற்குள்ளதொரு சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்குமென்ற கனவுபோலும் இருந்திருந்தாலும் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை எதிர்த்திருக்க மாட்டார்களென்றுதான் எனக்குத் தோன்றுகிறது. காங்கிரஸிலிருந்து அவர்களைத் தள்ளினார்களோ அல்லது அவர்கள் தாமாகவே அதிலிருந்து விலகினார்களோ என்று தெரியவில்லை. எந்த முறையில் குமாரி மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் காங்கிரஸிலிருந்து வெளியேறினார்கள் என்பதைப் பற்றி தெரிந்துகொள்ள நான் ஆசைப்படவில்லை. எது எப்படி இருந்தாலும் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் காங்கிரஸில் இருந்திருந்தால் இப்படி அவர்கள் இதை எதிர்த்திருக்க மாட்டார்கள். மேலும் சர், இன்று அசெம்பிளியில் வந்திருந்துகொண்டு, பாமரமக்கள் உண்ண உணவு இல்லாமல், உடுக்க உடை இல்லாமல், படுப்பதற்கு இடமில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்களென்று அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்களைப் போன்ற சிலர் பிரசங்கம் அடிப்பதைப் பார்த்தேன். இதெல்லாம் வெறும் கண் துடைப்பு வித்தை அல்லவா? மேலும் அம்மையார் மஸ்கிரீன் அவர்கள் "நான் மந்திரியாக இருந்தபோது மாதம் 500 ரூபாய் சேமிப்பதற்கு வசதியாயிருந்தது" என்று சொன்னார்கள். அதைச் சொன்னளவிலே, நீங்கள் ஏன் அப்பணத்தை திரும்ப பாமர ஜனங்களுக்காக கொடுக்கக் கூடாதென்று கேட்டளவில், உம்மிடம் கேட்டு நடக்கவேண்டாமென்று சொன்னார்கள். அப்படியானால் அதை இங்கு சொல்ல வரவேண்டியதில்லை. உண்மையில் பாமர மக்களை சகாயிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற மனப்பான்மை இப்படிப்பட்ட அம்மையார்களுக்கும், ஸ்ரீமான் இய்யு அவர்களைப் போன்ற பெரியார்களுக்கும் இருக்குமானால் அவர்கள் அதை நடைமுறையில் செய்து காண்பிக்கவேண்டும். அல்லாமல் lip service என்று சொல்வார்கள், அதாவது வாய் அளவிற்கு மட்டும் சொன்னால் போதாது. இங்ஙனம் சொல்லி மக்களை ஏமாற்றி வருங்காலத்தில் தேர்தலில் நின்று வெற்றி பெற்றுவிடலாமென்று நினைத்தால் அது நடக்காத காரியமென்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு நான் முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன், ஸர்.

Sri. K. Balakrishna Menon: May I know whether there is any particular reason for pressing this Bill at this stage?

Sri. K. M. Korah: The Bill was introduced long ago and it was referred to a Select Committee.

Sri. K. Balakrishna Menon: So far as the question of the enhancement of the pay of the Ministers is concerned, to me it looks, there are only two points to be taken into consideration. One is whether there is any pressing necessity for revising the scale of pay of the Ministers and the other is whether there is any future necessity for saying down a permament pay. So far as the first question is concerned, the Minister in charge has already stated that—I think he was speaking not only on behalf of himself but on behalf of his colleagues also—they are

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri K. Balakrishna Menon]

perfectly satisfied with the pay that they are getting at present so that in regard to that question the matter has been set at rest. Regarding the future necessity of fixing the pay, I heard the Minister saying that he would leave it for the next Legislative Assembly to take a decision on this question.

Now Sir, one other point on which I want to stress is this. We cannot draw any hard and fast line in fixing the pay. To say that the standard of the average man has been necessarily raised and that has been a precedent in the matter of raising the pay of any other officer is rather stretching the imagination too far. Even the pay of not only the Ministers but many other persons is subject to the economic conditions obtaining day to day. In 1937 probably the 750 rupees that the Ministers are drawing would have been more than enough. Today one finds it insufficient. And when once the Ministers are perfectly contented with what they are now getting, there is no other matter to pursue. It may be that the conditions may vary some time hence. Suppose it is still going higher. Then this 750 rupees will not be sufficient.

My friend Mr. Nataraja Pillai has stated that so far as our scale of pay is concerned, there should be a minimum fixed. If any member is going to ask what exactly is the maximum or minimum I believe my party also is not in a position to say what exactly it should be. We can only say that there should be a maximum and minimum in the matter of income of every individual. But in regard to the fixation of minimum it is a very difficult affair. The maximum can be very easily fixed. Therefore, my suggestion to this House is that it is not worth while for us to spend our time in discussing about this question especially because the Minister in charge has stated that so far as they are concerned, they are perfectly satisfied with the pay they are at present drawing and in the light of the fact that a new Assembly is going to be in existence very soon.

The amendment moved by Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni was put and lost.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

The clause was added to the Bill.

Clauses 4 and 5

The question that Clauses 4 and 5 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

The clauses were added to the Bill.

Clause 6

The question that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

The clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 7

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni : Sir, I am moving the sixth amendment.

"In clause 7 (2), between the words 'entitled' and 'to' insert the words 'while touring on public business'. The Clause with the amendment reads thus: "The Speaker and the Deputy Speaker shall be entitled while touring on public business to travelling and daily allowances at the rates specified in the Schedule and upon such conditions as may be specified by rules made by the Government". Sir, the wording as it is would mean that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker would be entitled to travelling and daily allowances even while not touring on public business, and hence it appears to me that their travelling and daily allowances must be limited, namely, to their travel on public business alone. It is for this purpose that I have moved this amendment.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair: On a point of information. Does it mean that travelling allowance is allowed only when they travel on official business ?

Sri. K. M. Korah: Yes.

Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair: Then, when they go on private business of their own, and when the travelling allowance becomes payable, will it not mislead the public ? That kind of thing will be more dangerous.

Sri. K. M. Korah: That is the very reason why the clause should stand as such.

Sri. K. Sivarama Pillai: The words, "while touring on public business" occurring in clause 7 (1) have been omitted in clause 7(2). So, so far as the Ministers are concerned, they are entitled to travelling and daily allowances only when they are on tour. So far as the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker are concerned, it does not arise.

Sri. K. M. Korah: Yes; it does not arise.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: Coming to the Assembly and going back—that is touring on public business. No other business is conceivable so far as the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker are concerned.

Sri. K. M. Korah: That does not entail any allowance.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: I was a member of the Select Committee and this difficulty was felt in the course of discussion in the Committee. "Touring on public business" is a term which cannot very easily be defined. "Official business" is a term which could be defined and is well known to the Accountant-General's office. When an officer is touring on official business, his travelling allowance will be checked by the Account and Audit office according to the well-known canons laid down by Government and they will be able to scrutinise it. But if you complicate it further by including the term "public business," that becomes a matter for interpretation. A Minister may be said to be on public business while inspecting a certain place. It may also be official business. That is, both these functions may go together. On the other hand, if a Speaker or Deputy Speaker is asked to do a piece of public business, it is something other than their official business. A Speaker or a Deputy Speaker can do only official business. What that official business is, is a matter that can be judged by the Audit Department. But, on the other hand we cannot tie down the hands of, or make the same provisions for, the Ministers who must have greater latitude on account of the exigencies of the office they hold. They would have to inspect or to go and see something at some place or meet a deputation or something of the kind. Therefore, this distinction must be borne in mind, and it is on this account that the words, "touring on public business" were inserted in respect of the Ministers and the same words omitted in respect of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. The Speaker and the Deputy Speaker will be entitled to daily and travelling allowances when they go on official business. That was the idea with which these clauses were framed.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: I wish to point out another matter. In item IV of the Schedule, "touring on public business" is included in respect of the Members of the Legislature. So, to remove all possible confusion, it will be necessary that the words are inserted in clause 7 (2) also.

Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair: Is there any objection in converting that "touring on public business" into "touring on official business?" in all these clauses? Is there any difference between these two phrases? I think "public business" may be vague but that "official business" may be accurate.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sri. K. M. Korah: In the Account Code, the term is "public business." It is in view of that that this particular phrase has been used here.

The amendment was put and lost.

The question that clause 7 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni : I move:

"In clause 8(1)(*b*), between the words 'Assembly' and 'at', insert the words "or of any committee thereof".

The amended clause will read like this:

"(*b*) In lieu of such consolidated allowance, travelling and daily allowances for attending the meetings of the Assembly or of any committee thereof, at the rates specified in the Schedule and subject to such rules as may be made by the Government".

In this connection I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the proviso to clause 9 which says:

"Provided that nothing in this Section shall authorize a member who receives a consolidated allowance under Section 8 to draw travelling and daily allowances for attending meetings of the Legislative Assembly or of any committee thereof."

In the proviso to Clause 9, the words "or of any committee thereof" are included but they have been omitted in this clause. I cannot see any reason why it ought not to find a place in clause 8(1)(*b*) also. I think it ought to be there, and it will be in consonance with practice also.

Sri. K. M. Korah : I accept this amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

The question that clause 8, as amended, stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

Clause 8, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 9 and 10.

The question that clauses 9 and 10 stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

Clauses 9 and 10 were added to the Bill.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Speaker: There is an amendment of which Mr. Udayabhanu has given notice this morning.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai : Under Rule 39 we have not sufficient notice of that amendment and I object to the amendment being moved.

Mr. Speaker: Though under the rules, two days' notice has to be given, the amendment is not of a very complicated nature and it was before the hon. Members his morning, and they would have had sufficient time to consider the amendment. I would therefore be justified in allowing Mr. Udayabhanu to move his amendment.

Sri. A. P. Udayabhanu : I beg to move.

"In the Schedule, in sub-clause (1) of item 1, for the words "ten r upees" in the two places where they occur, substitute the words "fifteen rupees,"

If this amendment is accepted, the Schedule would read like this:

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

"The Ministers and the Speaker shall be given daily and travelling allowances at the following rates for journeys performed by them.—
(1) inside the State of Travancore-Cochin a daily allowance of fifteen rupees when travelling by car, and actual plane fare and daily allowance of fifteen rupees when travelling by air;" etc.

I have introduced this amendment because in the schedule the rates of daily allowance provided for the Members of the Legislature and the Deputy Speaker are Rs. 15 per diem, as shown in item No. II. I do not think it would be proper to give Rs. 10 to the Speaker and Rs. 15 to the Deputy Speaker and Rs. 10 to the Ministers and Rs. 15 to the Members of the Legislature. So, it is only to correct this discrepancy that I move this amendment. For the sake of uniformity, it is only fair that this amendment is accepted.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: I beg to oppose the amendment. Coming as it does from Mr. Udayabhanu, a member of the Executive Committee of the party which rules the country, this amendment, I take it, is blessed by the Treasury Benches as well. If that be so, the Treasury Benches now want the daily allowance of Rs. 10 that has been fixed and has been followed hitherto, to be enhanced now. In that revision, it brings in a lot of complications as well. My friend has obviously forgotten the fact that a free car is allowed to the Speaker and the Ministers. In addition to the free car and petrol allowance, a daily batta of Rs. 10 is fixed. There is a discrimination in favour of the Deputy Speaker and the Members of the Legislature, in that they have been allowed Rs. 15. And the question of Mr. Udayabhanu is why the Ministers and the Speaker should not be paid Rs. 15 on the analogy of the Deputy Speaker and the Members of the House. I wish to point out that the members of the Treasury Bench get a pay, then travelling allowance, then a free house, then a free car and then a petrol allowance. Yet in addition to these, the claim for an enhanced allowance of Rs. 15 as daily allowance is put forward on their behalf. It is, to say the least, ununderstandable to me. This is not good sense at any rate. I hope the House will not be a party to this provision.

As I said at the very outset, this House has voted a particular amount as remuneration to these gentlemen. We are now at the fag end of the life of this House. Why should we revise it one way or another? Let us leave it as it is. After all, it is only a matter of a few months. When the new Legislature comes into being they will revise it as they want. Meanwhile, let us allow the status quo. Let us not disturb this at the end of the life of the Ministry and of this Legislature. After all, what reasons are there to revise the rate to a higher amount? How is this Rs. 10 incompatible with the concessions that the Ministers and the Speaker are getting? When they have got a car and petrol allowance, how is the daily allowance of Rs. 10 low? I think in the circumstances, my friends in this House will throw out the amendment without reserve. Further under clause 2 it will have retrospective effect.

[3 p.m.]

Sri. K. M. Korah: May I draw the attention of the hon. Member to Clause 2, section 1 from which it is clear that section 7 has no retrospective effect?

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: I am sorry I did not notice it. I thought it had also retrospective effect. That is why I said so. I admit my mistake. But the amendment is not bad on that count only. What I was saying was that there is no necessity to revise it now. When the Ministers have a car and other allowances, there is no necessity to increase the rate of daily batta. If any increase is considered necessary, it is for the new House to do so. So long our Ministers were able to get along with the existing rates. I am not going to discuss the question whether the Ministers do or do not deserve the increase. I do not want to go into

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai]

that question. I purposely avoid it. But what I say is, this House has accepted a certain rate. Let that continue. Let us not interfere with these things at the fag end of this Legislature. I am not dealing with the question whether Rs. 700 is adequate or not. That is not the issue now. My concern is we should not now disturb the rates fixed. And there is no reason why we should do it now.

Sri. K. Balakrishna Menon: May I know what exactly is the view of the Ministers?

Sri. K. M. Korah: We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni: I oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Udayabhanu. My reason is this. This aspect of the matter has already been considered by the Select Committee. The Clause is clear in the matter. So far as journeys inside the State are concerned, because the Ministers are provided with a car, the rates shall be a daily allowance of ten rupees when travelling by car, and actual plane fare and daily allowance of ten rupees when travelling by air. For journeys outside, the rates are, when travelling by train cost of one and a half first class railway fare, when travelling by road, a mileage of one rupee, when travelling by air, actual plane fare plus half first class railway fare and a daily allowance of thirty rupees except in Delhi, Calcutta and Bombay where the rate of daily allowance will be forty-five rupees. Thus the clause itself is a complete answer to this amendment. So that it is clear that the Select Committee have considered the question in every detail. In the face of this I fail to see how this amendment could be supported.

The amendment was put to the vote.

Mr. Speaker: It is not possible to ascertain the result by the show of hands.

Sri. N. Daniel Jose: I demand a poll.

A Poll was taken when the House divided as follows:

Ayes 30.

1. The hon. C. Kesavan.
2. The hon. K. M. Korah
3. The hon. L. M. Pylee.
4. The hon. G. Chandrasekhara Pillai
5. Sri. T. T. Kesavan Sastri
6. Sri. A. P. Udayabhanu
7. Sri. V. K. Varghese
8. Sri. P. Gopalan
9. Sri. Ambat Eachara Menon.
10. Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi
11. Sri. N. S. Kochukunju
12. Sri. Krishnan Ayyappan
13. Sri. Alexander Parambithara
14. Sri. Abdul Majeed
15. Sri. K. Ramakrishna Pillai
16. Sri. A. V. Joseph
17. Sri. K. S. Joseph
18. Sri. V. K. Joseph
19. Sri. P. Kunjukrishnan
20. Sri. T. V. Devan
21. Sri. Paulose Pylee
22. Sri. Paul Thaliath

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

23. Sri. P. Madhavan
24. Sahib Bahadur P. K. Makkar Pillai
25. Sri. N. V. Chacko
26. Sri. P. Nanoo
27. Sri. K. Sekhara Panicker
28. Sri. Varghese Augustin
29. Sri. Swamiappa Gounden
30. Sri. P. K. Paul

Noes 24.

1. Sri. Kalathil Velayudhan Nair
2. Sri. K. Sivarama Pillai
3. Sry. Annie Mascarene
4. Sri. P. C. George
5. Sri. Raphael J. Rodrigues
6. Sri. C. V. Iyyu
7. Sahib Bahadur T. A. Moideen Kunju
8. Sri. D. Ponniah
9. Sri. E. Gopalakrishna Menon
10. Sri. D. Gnanasigamoni
11. Sri. P. K. Kumaran Achari
12. Sri. Ponnara G. Sridhar
13. Sri. K. Ramakrishan Achari
14. Sri. A. K. Pachu Pillai
15. Sri. K. Ramachandran
16. Sri. C. C. Prasad
17. Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai
18. Sri. N. Daniel Jose
19. Sri. K. Achuthan
20. Sri. M. Govindan
21. Sri. A. Easwara Pillai
22. Sri. A. P. Nambiar
23. Sri. K. Balakrishna Menon
24. Sri. Gasper D'Silva

Neutral
None

The amendment was put and carried.

The schedule, as amended, was put and carried.

The schedule, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 and Preamble

The question that Clause 1 and the preamble stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Title

The question that the title stand part of the Bill was put and carried.

The title was added to the Bill.

Sri. K. M. Korah : I move that the Bill be passed.

Sri. C. Kesavan : I second it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: I would like to speak on the motion. When there are barely three or four months for the present ministry to be dissolved, the Government have thought it fit to bring in a Bill fixing the salaries and allowances of the Members, Ministers and the Speaker. In fact, it is only to give statutory recognition to what has been prevailing here so far. But at the same time, however, one notable change has been made, namely that the daily batta of the Ministers has been raised from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15. I can fully appreciate the reason for that step now. The Ministers are entitled to travel on public business. But we also know Sir, that we are facing a general election. Of course, opening a petty library here, or a hostel there, are all public business entitling the Ministers to daily batta and travelling allowance when they go for it. The only object seems to be to get as much money from the public exchequer as possible within this short time ahead while they tour for election. I am forced to come to that conclusion that is the main object of this Bill.....

Sr . A. P. Udayabhanu: Let me make it perfectly clear that that was not the object of my amendment.

Sri. P. S. Nataraja Pillai: With equal emphasis, I may say that I am forced to draw that conclusion. I am forced to say that that is the only conclusion, the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from the amendment which has been accepted by the House with a majority of the Congress members. I only want to sound a note of warning. We must always be fair in our dealings. Public money should not be spent for any purpose other than public purpose. And when an illegitimate object is sought to be gained at the expense of the public exchequer, I think it is my duty to sound a note of warning and to place it on record that it was not done with the full concurrence of the House but with the party votes.

Sri. A. P. Udayabhanu: Because my friend Mr. Nataraja Pillai was objecting to the Bill so heatedly and I happen to bring forward this amendment, I am forced to say a few words. Mr. Nataraja Pillai is one of the most respected members of this House. He has been saying that we are, or rather the party, is going to utilise this five-rupee margin for the election campaign. There are hardly two months before us for the election, just 60 days. We have five Ministers. Let us take it that the five Ministers, all of them, are going to tour all these sixty days. That means a gain of Rs. $60 \times 5 \times 5$, *i.e.*, Rs. 1,500. Is it to knock off Rs. 1,500 that we are passing this amendment? Can anything be more ridiculous? I do not know what sense of proportion there is, in advancing such an argument. If it was meant as a kind of party propaganda, I may tell openly that it is something which was not expected of such a very esteemed and senior member of this House.

Sri. N. D. Jose: Why should an amendment be introduced for such a petty sum, then?

Sri. A. P. Udayabhanu: Because on the face of it, it looked rather ridiculous that the Ministers and the Speaker should be getting Rs. 10 as daily allowances while the Members were getting Rs. 15. There was something odd in that arrangement. That was what induced me to move this amendment.

The question that the Bill be passed was put and carried.

The Bill was passed.

The Travancore-Cochin Forest Bill

Minister for Education and Revenue **(Sri. L. M. Pylee):** I beg to move that the time fixed for the submission of the Report of the Select Committee may be extended to 30th September 1951.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly